



ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND
SUSTAINABILITY CENTER

Publisher

<http://jssidoi.org/esc/home>



Business Support on Your Doorstep



FACTORS RELATED TO GENDER AND EDUCATION AFFECTING THE EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION *

Miloš Hitka ¹, Silvia Lorincová ², Milota Vetráková ³, Iveta Hajdúchová ⁴, Imrich Antalík ⁵

^{1,2} Faculty of Wood Sciences and Technology, Technical University in Zvolen, T. G. Masaryka 24, 96053 Zvolen, Slovakia

³ Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Tajovského 10, 975 90 Banská Bystrica, Slovakia

⁴ Faculty of Forestry, Technical University in Zvolen, T. G. Masaryka 24, 96053 Zvolen, Slovakia

⁵ Faculty of Economics, J. Selye University, Bratislavská cesta 3322, 945 01, Komárno, Slovakia

E-mails: ¹ hitka@tuzvo.sk; ² silvia.lorincova@tuzvo.sk; ³ milota.vetrakova@umb.sk; ⁴ hajduchova@tuzvo.sk;
⁵ antaliki@ujv.sk

Received 10 January 2020; accepted 10 April 2020; published 30 June 2020

Abstract. Enterprise is a place where an activity contributing to the success of a business is held. When an enterprise wants to succeed, achieve goals and to develop, employees must be in the centre of its attention. According to current trends, human resources are considered the most important of all the assets the organization possesses. Employee motivation can lead to high employee performance, effectiveness, quality, subsequent organisation success, and development. The research aimed at defining the differences in perceiving the level of motivation in terms of selected socio-demographic features was conducted in the Slovak enterprises over the course of the years 2015 - 2018. Following the achieved results, when creating the motivation programmes not only the gender but also the education completed by the employees must be taken into account by the senior managers.

Keywords: employee working motivation; differences; gender; education

* This research was supported by the project VEGA 1/0115/20 Dependence of corporate culture type upon selected socio-demographic factors and industries in Slovak enterprises, VEGA 1/0116/18 Convergence and divergence in the international human resource management, and APVV No. 18-0520 Innovative methods for analyzing the performance of wood and forestry complex using the principles of green growth.



European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Hitka, M., Lorincová, S., Vetráková, M., Hajdúchová, I., Antalík, I. 2020. Factors related to gender and education affecting the employee motivation. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, 7(4), 3226-3241. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.7.4\(43\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.7.4(43))

JEL Classifications: M12, M54

1. Introduction and theoretical background

Motivated employees are an important factor for the company success, development on the way to achieve the goals (Arnania-Kepuladze 2010; Hitka, Balážová 2015; Vydrová 2018). Motivated employees are those who are inspired and goal-driven. When the employees do not feel motivated or attracted, the company usually does not improve or progress (Ryan, Deci 2000; Manzoor 2011). The actual research (Feinstein 2000; Kropivšek et al. 2011; Khan 2012; Qayyum 2012; Lizbetinova 2014; Ruzzier, Konecnik Ruzzier 2014; Kucharcikova et al. 2015; Minárová 2015; Salyova et al. 2015; Faletar et al. 2016; Marková et al. 2016; Cagáňová et al. 2017; Malá et al. 2017; Peracek et al., 2017; Loucanova et al. 2018) highlighted the importance of motivation leading to the high employee performance, effectiveness, success and enterprise development. According to Delir et al. (2009) and Kanfer (1990) motivation is considered a driving force behind human behaviour necessary to meet the needs, to supply the energy and encourage desirable employee behaviour. It can be understood as anything affecting the human behaviour aimed at meeting the goal (Kontodimopoulos et al. 2009; Farajzade et al. 2013). It shows the level, direction and effort made in the workplace (Kachall 2014). It is an essential tool to control employees' behaviour in the workplace (Olusola 2011).

The role of motivation – to support others as well as the employees themselves, is the same for managers at all levels (Ryan, Deci 2000). In order to motivate employees properly, managers must be familiar with factors motivating employees in the workplace (Irum et al. 2012; Hajduková 2014; Damij et al. 2015; Wang 2016; Pingping 2017; Sánchez-Sellero et al. 2018; Vlacsekova 2019; Horváth, Hollósy 2019). The fact that employees are motivated by various factors must be taken into consideration (Ahmed 2010). A position of higher responsibility can be a motivation factor of an employee and another one can be motivated by flexible working hours or sense of success (Ahmed 2010). Lots of factors affecting the human behaviour were defined in the present research (Imhof 2003; Anitha 2014; Mura et al. 2019) such as: healthy working conditions, career opportunity, supportive boss, unambiguous and definite goals, competitive compensation, stable workplace, interesting job, high prestige, good performance evaluation, pleasant working atmosphere, peaceful private life, competent leadership, recognition, participation in decision-making and fringe benefits, working environment, management, training and professional development, salary, workplace, team work and relationship with co-workers.

Following the research studies, (Patton, Creed 2001; Gooderman et al. 2004; Peterson 2004; Meece et al. 2006) the fact that within the human resource strategy, the approach to an employee motivation in various areas of sociology must be different can be stated. Differences or similarities between individuals of the different gender, age or other socio-demographic characteristics (education, seniority) are defined in the research (Locke 1999; Kooij 2005; Arnania-Kepuladze 2010; Milošević et al. 2015; Olsovska et al. 2015; Musa et al. 2017; Olsovska, Svec 2017; Brady, King 2018; Svec et al., 2018; Fernández-Muñoz, Topa 2018; Kovařová et al. 2018; Štefko 2019; Malchrowicz-Moško et al. 2019). Based on the gender-role stereotypes, Arnania-Kepuladze (2010) mentioned that the goals and needs of men and women differ, therefore there are motivated in different way. Men want to be independent, have a power, be in a good job position, be popular and successful. They are especially motivated by an income, promotion or responsibility (Hofstede 2001). On the other hand, women prefer to be a part of a team, they look after the help of their colleagues (Peterson 2004). They appreciate friendly atmosphere,

prestige, challenge, job security, mutual cooperation (Hofstede 2001). They are motivated mainly by human relationships, sense of safety, social benefits and the environment (Meece et al. 2006). In terms of age, the baby-boom generation employees (1946-1964) are motivated by the position benefits and prestige (Kane 2010). Generation X (1966-1976) prefer flexible working hours, autonomy at work, interesting but difficult job and career opportunities (Murphy et al. 2010). The motivation of generation Y (1980-2000) is based on good team cooperation (Murphy et al. 2010). However, generation Z (1995-2012) is a large group of people accepting various values, norms, believes and priorities. Due to the fact that members of this group are in a different stage of the lifecycle (there is a very low probability they have children, house or mortgage), it can be assumed that their behaviour, attitudes as well as preferences completely differ from those of older generations (Freund 2006; Kanfer et al. 2008). Deiblová (2005) mentioned the fact that employees at younger age work towards changes knowingly and wilfully, they appreciate to be in a centre of interest, because they think about recognition and success in their professional career. On the other hand, employees at the middle age prefer the status, prestige. According to Sumit (2014) employees meeting their basic needs prefer financial reward, while others tend to be recognised and rewarded in different ways. Following the results of the research of Nguyen et al. (2014), the fact that respondents – more educated employees are more motivated by relationship in the workplace than respondents with primary education completed can be seen. According to Freund (2006), employees with higher education are motivated by the success. Presented research shows that each employee is motivated differently. Due to effective motivation of subordinates, each manager must be familiar with employees' needs that subsequently results in achieving good results at work. Moreover, the fact that each employee is unique with different needs and motivation must be taken into consideration. The aim of the paper is to define the differences in perceiving the level of motivation in terms of gender and education.

2. Materials and methods

The importance of motivation factors was investigated through the research carried out in the Slovak enterprises in the years 2015 – 2018. Questionnaires as a sociology research method were used. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Basic socio-demographic data about respondents (gender, education) were collected in the first part of the questionnaire. The second part was focused on the factors motivating the employees in terms of financial (basic salary, fair appraisal system, fringe benefits), in terms of social welfare (name of the company, social benefits, mission of the company, region's development, relation to the environment, free time), in terms of working conditions (physical effort at work, job security, workload and type of work, information about performance result, working hours, work environment, job performance, stress, mental effort), in terms of career aspiration (opportunity to apply one's own ability, career advancement, competences, prestige, individual decision-making, selfactualization, personal growth, recognition), in terms of human relationship (atmosphere in the workplace, good work team, communication in the workplace, supervisor's approach).

A total of 26,416 respondents participated in the questionnaire (13,663 men; 12,753 women; 689 respondents with primary education completed; 4,484 respondents with lower secondary education completed; 14,329 respondents with upper secondary education completed; 6,914 respondents with higher education completed). Respondents could assign each question to one of five levels of importance from the Likert scale, where five was the maximum and one the minimum value to show the importance of individual factors for respondents (5 = very important, 4 = important, 3 = neutral, 2 = slightly important, 1 = unimportant). Gathered data were evaluated using the statistical software Statistics 12.0. Using the χ^2 test at the level of significance $\alpha=5\%$ through statistics as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^s \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{(O_{ij}-E_{ij})^2}{E_{ij}}$$

following hypotheses were tested:

H₁: We assume that there are differences in motivation between men and women.

H₂: We assume that motivational needs of people with different level of education completed are different.

3. Results

In the first step, the level of importance of employee motivation was investigated through 30 motivation factors regardless of gender and completed education of respondents. Basic descriptive characteristics and 95% intervals of reliability of investigated motivation factors in the case of average values in the basic sampling unit are presented in Table 1. Following the given data, the results of the research could be generalised.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and 95% confidence intervals

| Motivation factor | Average | Standard deviation | Confidence interval | |
|----------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|
| | | | -95.00% | 95.00% |
| Basic salary | 4.494 | 0.82 | 4.48 | 4.50 |
| Fair appraisal system | 4.408 | 0.81 | 4.40 | 4.42 |
| Good work team | 4.406 | 0.76 | 4.40 | 4.42 |
| Job security | 4.398 | 0.82 | 4.39 | 4.41 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | 4.391 | 0.79 | 4.38 | 4.40 |
| Supervisor's approach | 4.354 | 0.83 | 4.34 | 4.36 |
| Fringe benefits | 4.330 | 0.81 | 4.32 | 4.34 |
| Communication in the workplace | 4.242 | 0.84 | 4.23 | 4.25 |
| Working hours | 4.186 | 0.86 | 4.18 | 4.20 |
| Work environment | 4.173 | 0.84 | 4.16 | 4.18 |
| Social benefits | 4.143 | 0.89 | 4.13 | 4.15 |
| Recognition | 4.122 | 0.89 | 4.11 | 4.13 |
| Job performance | 4.116 | 0.84 | 4.11 | 4.13 |
| Stress | 4.079 | 0.93 | 4.07 | 4.09 |
| Workload and type of work | 4.077 | 0.85 | 4.07 | 4.09 |
| Free time | 4.057 | 0.95 | 4.05 | 4.07 |
| Opportunity to apply one's own ability | 4.040 | 0.88 | 4.03 | 4.05 |
| Personal growth | 4.033 | 0.93 | 4.02 | 4.04 |
| Mental effort | 4.019 | 0.93 | 4.01 | 4.03 |
| Career advancement | 4.010 | 0.89 | 4.00 | 4.02 |
| Selfactualization | 3.978 | 0.90 | 3.97 | 3.99 |
| Individual decision-making | 3.971 | 0.90 | 3.96 | 3.98 |
| Information about performance result | 3.960 | 0.91 | 3.95 | 3.97 |
| Relation to the environment | 3.899 | 1.02 | 3.89 | 3.91 |
| Mission of the company | 3.873 | 0.99 | 3.86 | 3.88 |
| Competences | 3.864 | 0.95 | 3.85 | 3.88 |
| Name of the company | 3.845 | 1.05 | 3.83 | 3.86 |
| Physical effort at work | 3.821 | 0.95 | 3.81 | 3.83 |
| Region's development | 3.785 | 1.05 | 3.77 | 3.80 |
| Prestige | 3.710 | 1.01 | 3.70 | 3.72 |

Source: Own research

Following the results presented in Table 1, the fact that basic salary, fair appraisal system and good work team were considered three most important motivation factors can be seen. Motivation factor basic salary was evaluated with the level ranging between 4.48 – 4.50. The motivation factors fair appraisal system and good work team will be evaluated with 95% reliability with the same average level ranging from 4.40 to 4.42. Furthermore, following the results the fact that 20 motivation factors were evaluated with the level of importance of 4 (important) can be stated. 10 motivation factors were evaluated neutrally with the level of importance of 3 (neutral). 8 motivation factors marked with the highest level of importance by employees were selected for further research into motivation in terms of gender and education. Motivation factors basic salary, fair appraisal system, good work team, job security, atmosphere in the workplace, supervisor's approach, fringe benefits, communication in the workplace were examined in the further step of the research.

3.1. Factors affecting the employee motivation in terms of gender

Frequency of responses related to eight most important motivation factors in terms of gender are compared in Table 2.

Table 2. The importance of selected motivation factors in terms of gender

| Motivation factor | Gender | Frequency | Value of importance | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | 1 unimportant | 2 slightly important | 3 medium important | 4 important | 5 very important | |
| Basic salary | Male | Absolute frequency | 168 | 298 | 1,043 | 3,514 | 8,640 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.23% | 2.18% | 7.63% | 25.72% | 63.24% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 166 | 231 | 842 | 3,172 | 8,342 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.30% | 1.81% | 6.60% | 24.87% | 65.41% | 100% |
| Total | | 334 | 529 | 1,885 | 6,686 | 16,982 | 26,416 | |
| Fair appraisal system | Male | Absolute frequency | 124 | 263 | 1,397 | 4,396 | 7,483 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.91% | 1.92% | 10.22% | 32.17% | 54.77% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 137 | 270 | 1,007 | 3,782 | 7,557 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.07% | 2.12% | 7.90% | 29.66% | 59.26% | 100% |
| Total | | 261 | 533 | 2,404 | 8,178 | 15,040 | 26,416 | |
| Good work team | Male | Absolute frequency | 91 | 277 | 1,278 | 4,985 | 7,032 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.67% | 2.03% | 9.35% | 36.49% | 51.47% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 59 | 204 | 897 | 4,300 | 7,293 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.46% | 1.6% | 7.03% | 33.72% | 57.19% | 100% |
| Total | | 150 | 481 | 2,175 | 9,285 | 14,325 | 26,416 | |
| Job security | Male | Absolute frequency | 122 | 304 | 1,476 | 4,251 | 7,510 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.89% | 2.22% | 10.80% | 31.11% | 54.97% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 102 | 250 | 1,199 | 3,736 | 7,466 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.80% | 1.96% | 9.40% | 29.30% | 58.54% | 100% |
| Total | | 224 | 554 | 2,675 | 7,987 | 14,976 | 26,416 | |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Male | Absolute frequency | 120 | 264 | 1,410 | 4,887 | 6,982 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.88% | 1.93% | 10.32% | 35.77% | 51.10% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 92 | 185 | 997 | 4,187 | 7,292 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.72% | 1.45% | 7.82% | 32.83% | 57.18% | 100% |
| Total | | 212 | 449 | 2,407 | 9,074 | 14,273 | 26,416 | |
| Supervisor's approach | Male | Absolute frequency | 150 | 349 | 1,469 | 4,838 | 6,857 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.10% | 2.55% | 10.75% | 35.41% | 50.19% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 118 | 298 | 1,126 | 4,014 | 7,197 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.93% | 2.34% | 8.82% | 31.48% | 56.44% | 100% |
| Total | | 268 | 647 | 2,594 | 8,852 | 14,054 | 26,416 | |
| Fringe benefits | Male | Absolute frequency | 121 | 337 | 1,484 | 4,868 | 6,853 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.89% | 2.47% | 10.86% | 35.63% | 50.16% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 107 | 272 | 1,167 | 4,787 | 6,420 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.84% | 2.13% | 9.15% | 37.53% | 50.35% | 100% |
| Total | | 228 | 609 | 2,651 | 9,655 | 13,273 | 26,416 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------|------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Communication in the workplace | Male | Absolute frequency | 131 | 418 | 2,006 | 5,451 | 5,657 | 13,663 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.96% | 3.06% | 14.68% | 39.90% | 41.40% | 100% |
| | Female | Absolute frequency | 114 | 286 | 1,375 | 4,722 | 6,256 | 12,753 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.89% | 2.24% | 10.77% | 37.03% | 49.06% | 100% |
| | Total | | 245 | 704 | 3,380 | 10,173 | 11,913 | 26,416 |

Source: Own reseach

Following the results presented in Table 2, the fact that men as well as women evaluated all investigated motivation factors with the level of importance of 5, i.e. very important, can be seen. Moreover, each examined motivation factor was evaluated with the level of importance of 5 – very important, by higher percentage of women in comparison to men.

Table 3. Testing the selected motivation factors in terms of gender

| Motivation factor | Statistical indicator | Chi-square | Degree of freedom | p-level |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Basic salary | Pearson's chi-square | 21.30 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 21.34 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Fair appraisal system | Pearson's chi-square | 79.22 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 79.44 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Good work team | Pearson's chi-square | 108.72 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 109.07 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Job security | Pearson's chi-square | 37.70 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 37.74 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Pearson's chi-square | 117.87 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 118.22 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Supervisor's approach | Pearson's chi-square | 107.10 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 107.22 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Fringe benefits | Pearson's chi-square | 29.14 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 29.21 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| Communication in the workplace | Pearson's chi-square | 195.28 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 195.94 | df = 4 | p = 0.000 |

Source: Own reseach

Following the χ^2 test results shown in Table 3, the alternative hypothesis H₁ was accepted and the hypothesis H₀ was rejected. The fact that the level of importance of the analysed motivation factors depends on gender can be stated.

Table 4. Residual frequency of selected motivation factors in terms of gender

| Motivation factor | Gender | Value of importance | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | 1 unimportant | 2 slightly important | 3 medium important | 4 important | 5 very important |
| Basic salary | Male | -4.76 | 24.38 | 68.00 | 55.71 | -143.32 |
| | Female | 4.76 | -24.38 | -68.00 | -55.71 | 143.32 |
| Fair appraisal system | Male | -11.00 | -12.68 | 153.59 | 166.14 | -296.06 |
| | Female | 11.00 | 12.68 | -153.59 | -166.14 | 296.06 |
| Good work team | Male | 13.42 | 28.22 | 153.04 | 182.57 | -377.24 |
| | Female | -13.42 | -28.22 | -153.04 | -182.57 | 377.24 |
| Job security | Male | 6.14 | 17.45 | 92.37 | 119.77 | -235.73 |
| | Female | -6.14 | -17.45 | -92.37 | -119.77 | 235.73 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Male | 10.34 | 31.76 | 164.99 | 193.53 | -400.62 |
| | Female | -10.34 | -31.76 | -164.99 | -193.53 | 400.62 |
| Supervisor's approach | Male | 11.38 | 14.34 | 127.27 | 259.36 | -412.35 |
| | Female | -11.38 | -14.34 | -127.27 | -259.36 | 412.35 |
| Fringe benefits | Male | 3.07 | 22.00 | 112.79 | -125.47 | -12.38 |
| | Female | -3.07 | -22.00 | -112.79 | 125.47 | 12.38 |
| Communication in the workplace | Male | 4.28 | 53.86 | 257.72 | 189.08 | -504.93 |
| | Female | -4.28 | -53.86 | -257.72 | -189.08 | 504.93 |

Source: Own reseach

The results presented in Table 4 shows that basic salary was considered very important motivation factor by women. Men tended to be neutral in the case of motivation factor basic salary. Fair appraisal system was again considered very important by women while according to men, the mentioned factor was considered important or neutral. Women tended to perceive motivation factors good work team, job security, atmosphere in the workplace as very important ones. On the other hand, men considered the mentioned motivation factors important. Motivation factors fringe benefits and communication in the workplace were of neutral importance for men. For women, the mentioned motivation factors were important even very important.

3.2. Factors affecting the employee motivation in terms of completed education

In the next step, selected motivation factors (basic salary, fair appraisal system, good work team, job security, atmosphere in the workplace, supervisor's approach, fringe benefits, communication in the workplace) were investigated in terms of completed education. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. The importance of selected motivation factors in terms of completed education

| Motivation factor | Education | Frequency | Value of importance | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | | 1 unimportant | 2 slightly important | 3 medium important | 4 important | 5 very important | |
| Basic salary | Primary | Absolute frequency | 19 | 21 | 68 | 174 | 407 | 689 |
| | | Relative frequency | 2.76% | 3.05% | 9.87% | 25.25% | 59.07% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 90 | 123 | 367 | 1,060 | 2,844 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 2.01% | 2.74% | 8.18% | 23.64% | 63.43% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 161 | 275 | 993 | 3,550 | 9,350 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.12% | 1.92% | 6.93% | 24.77% | 65.26% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 64 | 110 | 457 | 1,903 | 4,380 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.93% | 1.59% | 6.61% | 27.52% | 63.35% | 100% |
| | Total | | 334 | 529 | 1,885 | 6,686 | 16,981 | 26,416 |
| | Fair appraisal system | Primary | Absolute frequency | 20 | 36 | 87 | 212 | 334 |
| Relative frequency | | | 2.90% | 5.22% | 12.63% | 30.77% | 48.48% | 100% |
| High school without GCSE | | Absolute frequency | 65 | 112 | 501 | 1,426 | 2,380 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.45% | 2.50% | 11.17% | 31.80% | 53.08% | 100% |
| High school with GCSE | | Absolute frequency | 118 | 263 | 1,308 | 4,420 | 8,220 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.82% | 1.84% | 9.13% | 30.85% | 57.37% | 100% |
| University | | Absolute frequency | 58 | 122 | 508 | 2,120 | 4,106 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.84% | 1.76% | 7.35% | 30.66% | 59.39% | 100% |
| Total | | | 261 | 533 | 2,404 | 8,178 | 15,040 | 26,416 |
| Good work team | | Primary | Absolute frequency | 14 | 33 | 96 | 256 | 290 |
| | Relative frequency | | 2.03% | 4.79% | 13.93% | 37.16% | 42.09% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 38 | 129 | 514 | 1,734 | 2,069 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.85% | 2.88% | 11.46% | 38.67% | 46.14% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 66 | 215 | 1,124 | 5,035 | 7,889 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.46% | 1.50% | 7.84% | 35.14% | 55.06% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 32 | 104 | 441 | 2,260 | 4,077 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.46% | 1.50% | 6.38% | 32.69% | 58.97% | 100% |
| | Total | | 150 | 481 | 2,175 | 9,285 | 14,325 | 26,416 |
| | Job security | Primary | Absolute frequency | 12 | 32 | 104 | 230 | 311 |
| Relative frequency | | | 1.74% | 4.64% | 15.09% | 33.38% | 45.14% | 100% |
| High school without GCSE | | Absolute frequency | 60 | 167 | 520 | 1,579 | 2,158 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.34% | 3.72% | 11.60% | 35.21% | 48.13% | 100% |
| High school with GCSE | | Absolute frequency | 110 | 291 | 1,413 | 5,212 | 7,303 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.77% | 2.03% | 9.87% | 36.44% | 51.09% | 100% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | GCSE | Relative frequency | 0.77% | 2.03% | 9.85% | 36.38% | 50.97% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 46 | 119 | 615 | 2,633 | 3,501 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.67% | 1.72% | 8.89% | 38.08% | 50.64% | 100% |
| | Total | | 228 | 609 | 2,652 | 9,654 | 13,273 | 26,416 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Primary | Absolute frequency | 11 | 32 | 111 | 209 | 326 | 689 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.59% | 4.64% | 16.11% | 30.33% | 47.32% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 53 | 130 | 564 | 1,702 | 2,035 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.18% | 2.90% | 12.58% | 37.96% | 45.38% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 99 | 196 | 1,247 | 4,981 | 7,806 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.68% | 1.37% | 8.70% | 34.76% | 54.48% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 50 | 91 | 485 | 2,182 | 4,106 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.72% | 1.32% | 7.01% | 31.56% | 59.39% | 100% |
| Total | | 212 | 449 | 2,407 | 9,074 | 14,273 | 26,416 | |
| Supervisor's approach | Primary | Absolute frequency | 15 | 38 | 95 | 235 | 306 | 689 |
| | | Relative frequency | 2.18% | 5.52% | 13.79% | 34.11% | 44.41% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 68 | 148 | 530 | 1,617 | 2,121 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.52% | 3.30% | 11.82% | 36.06% | 47.30% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 124 | 327 | 1,411 | 4,705 | 7,762 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.86% | 2.28% | 9.85% | 32.84% | 54.17% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 62 | 134 | 558 | 2,295 | 3,865 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.90% | 1.94% | 8.07% | 33.19% | 55.90% | 100% |
| Total | | 269 | 647 | 2,594 | 8,852 | 14,054 | 26,416 | |
| Fringe benefits | Primary | Absolute frequency | 12 | 32 | 104 | 230 | 311 | 689 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.74% | 4.64% | 15.09% | 33.38% | 45.14% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 60 | 167 | 520 | 1,579 | 2,158 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.34% | 3.72% | 11.60% | 35.21% | 48.13% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 110 | 291 | 1,413 | 5,212 | 7,303 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.77% | 2.03% | 9.85% | 36.38% | 50.97% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 46 | 119 | 615 | 2,633 | 3,501 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.67% | 1.72% | 8.89% | 38.08% | 50.64% | 100% |
| Total | | 228 | 609 | 2,652 | 9,654 | 13,273 | 26,416 | |
| Communication in the workplace | Primary | Absolute frequency | 15 | 47 | 131 | 246 | 250 | 689 |
| | | Relative frequency | 2.18% | 6.82% | 19.01% | 35.70% | 36.28% | 100% |
| | High school without GCSE | Absolute frequency | 58 | 178 | 704 | 1,831 | 1,713 | 4,484 |
| | | Relative frequency | 1.29% | 3.97% | 15.70% | 40.83% | 38.20% | 100% |
| | High school with GCSE | Absolute frequency | 117 | 338 | 1,857 | 5,553 | 6,464 | 14,329 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.82% | 2.36% | 12.95% | 38.76% | 45.11% | 100% |
| | University | Absolute frequency | 55 | 141 | 689 | 2,543 | 3,486 | 6,914 |
| | | Relative frequency | 0.80% | 2.04% | 9.97% | 36.78% | 50.42% | 100% |
| Total | | 245 | 704 | 3,381 | 10,173 | 11,913 | 26,416 | |

Source: Own research

Following the results presented in Table 5, the fact that all analysed motivation factors were evaluated by the respondents with the level of importance of 5, i.e. very important, motivation factor, with the exception of the motivation factor communication in the workplace evaluated by most of the respondents (40.83%) with the lower secondary education completed with the level of importance of 4 (important).

The results of statistical verification between the level of completed education and the selected motivation factors are shown in Table 6. Following the results mentioned in Table 6 the hypothesis H_1 is accepted and the hypothesis H_0 is rejected. The fact that the level of motivation depends on the education can be stated.

Table 6. Testing the selected motivation factors in terms of completed education

| Motivation factor | Statistical indicator | Chi-square | Degree of freedom | p-level |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Basic salary | Pearson's chi-square | 106.73 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 98.85 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Fair appraisal system | Pearson's chi-square | 168.90 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 147.96 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Good work team | Pearson's chi-square | 356.41 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 326.56 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Job security | Pearson's chi-square | 167.88 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 155.10 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Pearson's chi-square | 378.68 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 352.05 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Supervisor's approach | Pearson's chi-square | 186.57 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 175.74 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Fringe benefits | Pearson's chi-square | 148.77 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 134.87 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| Communication in the workplace | Pearson's chi-square | 319.56 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |
| | M-V chi-square | 300.21 | df = 12 | p = 0.000 |

Source: Own research

Despite the fact that eight investigated motivation factors are considered the most important, Table 6 shows that there are statistically significant differences in the motivation in terms of completed education. The results in Table 6 are confirmed by further results presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Residual frequency of selected motivation factors in terms of completed education

| Motivation factor | Education | Value of importance | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|
| | | 1 unimportant | 2 slightly important | 3 medium important | 4 important | 5 very important |
| Basic salary | Primary | 10.29 | 7.20 | 18.83 | -0.40 | -35.93 |
| | High school without GCSE | 33.30 | 33.20 | 47.02 | -74.96 | -38.56 |
| | High school with GCSE | -20.17 | -11.94 | -29.46 | -77.61 | 139.18 |
| | University | -23.42 | -28.46 | -36.39 | 152.97 | -64.70 |
| Fair appraisal system | Primary | 13.19 | 22.10 | 24.30 | -1.30 | -58.28 |
| | High school without GCSE | 20.70 | 21.53 | 92.93 | 37.82 | -172.97 |
| | High school with GCSE | -23.58 | -26.12 | 3.98 | -16.04 | 61.76 |
| | University | -10.31 | -17.50 | -121.21 | -20.47 | 169.50 |
| Good work team | Primary | 10.09 | 20.45 | 39.27 | 13.82 | -83.63 |
| | High school without GCSE | 12.54 | 47.35 | 144.80 | 157.91 | -362.61 |
| | High school with GCSE | -15.37 | -45.91 | -55.80 | -1.52 | 118.60 |
| | University | -7.26 | -21.89 | -128.27 | -170.21 | 327.64 |
| Job security | Primary | 10.16 | 14.55 | 38.23 | 7.67 | -70.60 |
| | High school without GCSE | 15.98 | 34.96 | 95.91 | 81.19 | -228.04 |
| | High school with GCSE | -11.50 | -23.50 | -36.97 | -111.30 | 183.27 |
| | University | -14.63 | -26.01 | -97.17 | 22.44 | 115.37 |
| Atmosphere in the workplace | Primary | 5.47 | 20.29 | 48.22 | -27.68 | -46.29 |
| | High school without GCSE | 17.02 | 53.78 | 155.41 | 161.67 | -387.87 |
| | High school with GCSE | -16.99 | -47.55 | -58.60 | 59.09 | 64.05 |
| | University | -5.49 | -26.52 | -145.02 | -193.08 | 370.11 |
| Supervisor's approach | Primary | 8.01 | 21.12 | 27.34 | 4.11 | -60.58 |
| | High school without GCSE | 22.51 | 38.17 | 89.66 | 114.35 | -264.70 |
| | High school with GCSE | -22.37 | -23.95 | 3.96 | -96.49 | 138.84 |
| | University | -8.15 | -35.35 | -120.97 | -21.97 | 186.43 |
| Fringe benefits | Primary | 6.05 | 16.12 | 34.85 | -21.81 | -35.21 |
| | High school without GCSE | 21.30 | 63.62 | 69.99 | -59.79 | -95.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Communication in the workplace | High school with GCSE | -13.67 | -39.33 | -25.95 | -24.51 | 103.47 |
| | University | -13.68 | -40.40 | -78.89 | 106.11 | 26.86 |
| | Primary | 8.61 | 28.64 | 42.84 | -19.35 | -60.73 |
| | High school without GCSE | 16.41 | 58.49 | 130.24 | 104.11 | -309.26 |
| | High school with GCSE | -15.89 | -43.86 | 22.62 | 34.97 | 2.16 |
| | University | -9.13 | -43.27 | -195.70 | -119.73 | 367.83 |

Source: Own research

Despite the fact that the respondents with primary education completed consider analysed motivation factors very important, they tend to evaluate analysed motivation factors neutrally (the level of importance of 3) even slightly important (the level of importance of 2) (Table 7). The respondents with lower secondary education tend to evaluate analysed motivation factors as neutral (the level of importance of 3) even important (the level of importance 4) motivation factors. The more educated respondents tend to evaluate analysed motivation factors with higher level of importance. The respondents with upper secondary education and higher education tend to evaluate the investigated motivation factors as important (the level of importance of 4) even very important (the level of importance of 5).

Discussion and conclusions

Enterprise is a place where an activity contributing to the success of a business is held. In order to succeed there must be a person able to manage the business excellently (Bajzikova et al. 2013; Bartuska et al. 2016; Kampf et al. 2016; Stopka et al. 2016; Gejdos, Vlckova 2017; Grenčíková et al. 2017; Joniaková et al. 2017; Lizbetinova 2017; Zaborova et al. 2017; Lizbetin 2018; Papula et al. 2018; Sertić et al. 2018; Anyakoha 2019; Hasan et al. 2019; Matzembacher et al. 2019). All efforts must be given to employees as the human resources are considered the greatest asset of the business (ShaemiBarzoki et al. 2012; Fernández-Olmos, Díez-Vial 2015; Sheehan et al. 2016; Urbancova et al. 2016; Jankelová et al. 2017; Kampf et al. 2017; Kucharcikova, Miciak 2017; Nemeč et al. 2017; Bencsik et al. 2019; Kimengsi et al. 2019; Paluš et al. 2019; Sedliačiková et al. 2019; Stachová et al. 2019). The main role of managers is to motivate employees to achieve the goals. It means one of the most important difficulties the managers face in the business environment (Richer et al. 2002; Latham, Pinder 2005; Latham 2007; Kanfer et al. 2008). Not only the environment and situation but also factors like gender, education, age affecting the needs of individuals must be taken into account. Mentioned conclusions are confirmed by the research results of Kachall (2014), mentioning the fact that employee motivation is affected by varied personal, mental, financial as well as social factors. According to Nadeem et al. (2011), there are lots of variables affecting the employee motivation. The opinion of Ryan and Deci (2000) is similar. The employees are motivated; there are differences in the level of their motivation especially due to socio-demographic characteristics.

The research focused on investigating the level of motivation in terms of selected socio-demographic characteristics was conducted in the years 2015 – 2018. 26,416 respondents participated in the research. The motivation factors such as basic salary, fair appraisal system, good work team, job security, atmosphere in the workplace, supervisor's approach, fringe benefits, communication in the workplace were considered the most important motivation factors. Following the achieved results, in the process of creating motivation programmes managers are recommended to take into account the fact that motivation is affected by gender. Women tend to consider motivation factors more important than men. They are evaluated as important even very important by women in comparison to men who tend to evaluate them as important even neutral. Actual research studies are confirmed by our findings (Arnania-Kepuladze 2010; Fapohunda 2017). The fact that goals and needs of men and women are different and therefore, they must be motivated in different way can be seen. Men want to be independent, want to have power, position, and want to be popular and successful. They are motivated by income, promotion, and responsibility (Hofstede 2001). On the contrary, women prefer to work in a team; they look after the cooperation with colleagues (Peterson 2004). Friendly atmosphere, prestige, challenge, job security, and

cooperation are appreciated by them (Hofstede 2001). They are mainly motivated by human relationship, sense of safety, social benefit and the environment (Meece et al. 2006).

The human needs change not only due to the gender (Patton, Creed 2001; Gooderman et al. 2004; Meece et al. 2006) but following the actual research (Nguyen et al. 2014) as well as our research, the fact that there is an effect of education as well can be stated. In the issue of motivation programmes, the differences resulting from the different level of employee education must be taken into consideration by managers. The respondents with primary education tend to evaluate motivation factors as neutral even slightly important. According to the respondents with lower secondary education, the motivation factors are neutral even important and the respondents with upper secondary education and higher education consider the motivation factors important even very important.

References

- Ahmed, I.; Nawaz, M. M.; Iqbal, N.; Ali, I.; Shaukat, Z.; & Usman, A. 2010. Effects of motivational factors on employees job satisfaction a case study of university of the Punjab, Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Management* 5(3): 70-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n3p70>
- Anitha, J. 2014. Determinants of employee engagement and the impact on employee performance, *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* 63(3): 308-323. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2013-0008>
- Anyakoha, C. 2019. Job analysis as a tool for improved organizational performance of SMEs in Lagos, Nigeria, *Central European Journal of Labour Law and Personnel Management* 2(1): 7-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33382/cejllpm.2019.02.01>
- Armania-Kepuladze, T. 2010. Gender stereotypes and gender feature of job motivation: differences or similarity? *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 8(2): 84-93.
- Bajzikova, L.; Sajgalikova, H.; Wojcack, E.; & Polakova, M. 2013. Are flexible work arrangements attractive enough for knowledge-intensive businesses? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 99: 771-783. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.549>
- Bartuska, L.; Hanzl, J.; & Lizbetinova, L. 2016. Possibilities of using the data for planning the cycling infrastructure, *Procedia Engineering* 161: 282-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.08.555>
- Bencsik, A.; Juhasz, T.; Mura, L.; & Csanadi, A. 2019. Impact of informal knowledge sharing for organizational operation, *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review* 7(3): 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2019.070302>
- Brady, P. Q.; & King, W. R. 2018. Brass satisfaction: Identifying the personal and work-related factors associated with job satisfaction among police chiefs, *Police Quarterly* 21, 250-277. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098611118759475>
- Cagáňová, D.; Stareček, A.; Bednářiková, M.; & Horňáková, N. 2017. Analysis of factors influencing the motivation of generations Y and Z to perform in the educational process. *The 15th IEEE International Conference "Emerging eLearning Technologies and Applications"*, October 26-27, Starý Smokovec, Slovakia.
- Damij, N.; Levnajić, Z.; Skrt, V. R.; & Suklan, J. 2015. What motivates us for work? Intricate web of factors beyond money and prestige, *PLoS ONE* 10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0132641>
- Deiblová, M. 2005. *Motivace jako nástroj řízení* (Motivation as a management tool) Praha, Czech Republic: Linde.
- Delir, Z.; Shoja'ivan, Z.; & Khodabandelou, Z. 2009. Investigating motivational level of nursing and midwifery students related to choosing their majors. Mashhad college of nursing and midwifery, *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 185, 185-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.447>
- Faletar, J.; Jelačić, D.; Sedliačiková, M.; Jazbec, A.; & Hajdúchová, I. 2016. Motivating employees in a wood processing company before and after restructuring, *BioResources* 11(1): 2504-2515. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15376/biores.11.1.2504-2515>
- Fapohunda, T. M. 2017. Gender and impression management in the workplace. *Acta Oeconomica Universitatis Selye* 6(2): 47-56.

- Farajzade, Z.; Jodat, S. H.; & Saadatjo, A. 2013. Evaluation of motivation among nurses working in hospitals Valiasser Birjand in 1392, *Scientific Research Quarterly* 10(4): 296-304.
- Feinstein, A. H. 2000. *A Study of Relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Restaurant Employees*. Retrieved from: <https://elmuobbie.files.wordpress.com/2009/01/astudyofrelationshipsbetweenjobsatisfactionand.pdf>
- Fernández-Muñoz, J. J.; & Topa, G. 2018. Older workers and affective job satisfaction: Gender invariance in Spain, *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00930>
- Fernández-Olmos, M.; & Díez-Vial, I. 2015. Intangible resources, export channel and performance: is there any fit? *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 16(5): 1013-1033. <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2012.726928>
- Freund, A. M. 2006. Age-differential motivational consequences of optimization versus compensation focus in younger and older adults, *Psychology and Aging* 21(2): 240-252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.2.240>
- Gejdos, M.; & Vlckova, M. 2017. Analysis of work accidents in timber transport in Slovakia. The 18th International Scientific Conference "LOGI 2017" October 19, Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic. <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201713400014>
- Gooderman, P.; Nordhaug, O.; Ringdal, K.; & Birkelund, E. 2004. Job values among future business leaders: The impact of gender and social background, *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 20(3): 277-295.
- Grenčíková, A.; Guščinskienė, J.; & Španková, J. 2017. The role of leadership in motivating employees in a trading company, *Journal of Security and Sustainability Issues* 7(2): 67-75. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.7.2\(6\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jssi.2017.7.2(6))
- Hajduková, A. 2014. Impact of regional differences on apprehending of the significance of labour factors motivating the employees of woodworking industry on Slovakia, *Acta Facultatis Xylogiae* 56(1): 119-128.
- Hasan, M.; Hatidja, St.; Nurjanna; Guampe, F. A.; Gempita; & Maruf, M. I. 2019. Entrepreneurship learning, positive psychological capital and entrepreneur competence of students: A research study, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 7(1): 425-437. [http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.7.1\(30\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2019.7.1(30))
- Hitka, M.; & Balážová, Ž. 2015. The impact of age, education and seniority on motivation of employees, *Business: Theory and Practice* 16(1): 113-120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/btp.2015.433>
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Horváth, Zs.; & Hollósy, V. G. 2019. The revision of Hungarian public service motivation (PSM) model, *Central European Journal of Labour Law and Personnel Management* 2(1): 17-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33382/cejllpm.2019.02.02>
- Imhof, E. 2003. Comparing occupational and gender differences on motivational structure, *Periodica Polytechnica, Social and Management Sciences* 11(2): 237-247.
- Irum, S.; Sultana, A.; Ahmed, K.; & Mehmood, N. 2012. Work motivation differences in public and private sector (A study of higher education institutes in Pakistan), *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 4(6): 685.
- Jankelová, N.; Joniaková, Z.; Blštáková, J.; & Némethová, I. 2017. Readiness of human resource departments of agricultural enterprises for implementation of the new roles of human resource professionals, *Agric. Econ. – Czech* 63(10): 461-470. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17221/189/2016-AGRICECON>
- Joniaková, Z.; Blštáková, J.; Némethová, I.; Stachová, K.; & Stacho, Z. 2017. Current approaches to employee training and their applications in business. The Global Scientific Conference "Management and Economics in Manufacturing" October 5-6, Zvolen, Slovakia.
- Kachall, B. 2014. Review of the role of motivation on employee performance, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 5(17): 39-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n17p39>
- Kampf, R.; Lizbetinova, L.; & Tislerova, K. 2017. Management of customer service in terms of logistics information systems, *Open Engineering* 7(1): 26-30.
- Kampf, R.; Stopka, O.; Kubasakova, I.; & Zitricky, V. 2016. Macroeconomic evaluation of projects regarding the traffic constructions and equipment, *Procedia Engineering* 161: 1538-1544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.08.623>

- Kane, S. 2010. *Baby Boomers in Workplace*. Retrieved from: <http://legalcareers.about.com/od/practicetips/a/Babyboomers.htm>
- Kanfer, R. 1990. *Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology*. Dunnette, M.D., Hough, L.M. (Eds.).
- Kanfer, R.; Chen, G.; & Pritchard, R. D. 2008. Work motivation: Forging new perspectives and directions in the post-millennium, in Kanfer, R.; Chen, G.; & Pritchard, R. D. (Ed.). *Work motivation: Past, present, and future*. New York: Taylor & Francis, pp. 601-631.
- Khan, M. I. 2012. The impact of training and motivation on performance of employees, *Business Review* 7(2): 84-95.
- Kimengsi, J. N.; Bhusal, P.; Aryal, A.; Fernandez, M. V. B. C.; Owusu, R.; Chaudhary, A.; & Nielsen, W. 2019. What (de)motivates forest users' participation in co-management? Evidence from Nepal, *Forests* 10(6): 512. <https://doi.org/10.3390/f10060512>
- Kontodimopoulos, N.; Paleologou, V.; & Niakas, D. 2009. Identifying important motivational factors for professionals in Greek hospitals, *BMC Health Serv Res* 9(1): 164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-9-164>
- Kooij, D. 2005. Successful aging at work: The active role of employees, *Work, Aging and Retirement* 1: 309-319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/workar/wav018>
- Kovaľová, M.; Hvolková, L.; Klement, L.; & Klementová, V. 2018. Innovation strategies in the Slovak enterprises, *Acta Oeconomica Universitatis Selye* 7(1): 79-89.
- Kropivšek, J.; Jelačić, D.; & Grošelj, P. 2011. Motivating employees of Slovenian and Croatian wood-industry companies in times of economic downturn, *Drvena Industrija* 62(2), 97-103. <https://doi.org/10.5552/drind.2011.1040>
- Kucharcikova, A.; & Miciak, M. 2017. Human capital management in transport enterprise. The 18th International Scientific Conference "LOGI 2017" October 19, Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201713400030>
- Kucharcikova, A.; Tokarcikova, E.; & Durisova, M. 2015. Human capital efficiency in trading company. *9th International Days of Statistics and Economics*, September 10-12, Prague, Czech Republic, 892-901.
- Latham, G. P. 2007. *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Latham, G. P.; & Pinder, C. C. 2005. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century, *Annual Review of Psychology* 56: 485-516.
- Lizbetin, J. 2018. Decision-making processes in introducing RFID technology in manufacturing company, *Nase More* 65(4): 289-292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17818/NM/2018/4SI.23>
- Lizbetinova, L. 2014. The quality of communication in the context of regional development, *Deturope-The Central European Journal of Regional Development and Tourism* 6(3): 22-38.
- Lizbetinova, L. 2017. Clusters of Czech consumers with focus on domestic brands. "The International-Business-Information-Management-Association Conference Sustainable Economic Growth, Education Excellence, and Innovation Management Through Vision 2020", May 3-4, Vienna, Austria, pp. 1703-1718.
- Locke, E. A. 1999. The motivation sequence, the motivation hub and the motivation core, *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 50, 288-299.
- Loucanova, E.; Olsiakova, M.; & Dzian, M. 2018. Suitability of innovative marketing communication forms in the furniture industry, *Acta Facultatis Xylogologiae Zvolen* 60(1): 159-171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17423/afx.2018.60.1.17>
- Malá, D.; Sedliačiková, M.; Dušak, M.; Kašćáková, A.; Musová, Z.; & Klementová, J. 2017. Green logistics in the context of sustainable development in small and medium enterprises, *Drvena Industrija* 68(1), 69-79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5552/drind.2017.1620>
- Malchrowicz-Moško, E.; Młodzik, M.; León-Guereño, P.; & Adamczewska, K. 2019. Male and female motivations for participating in a mass cycling race for amateurs. The skoda bike challenge case study, *Sustainability* 11, 6635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su11236635>
- Manzoor, Q. 2011. Impact of employees motivation on organizational effectiveness, *European Journal of Business and Management* 3(3): 36-45.

- Marková, V.; Sedliačiková, M.; & Gurova, D. H. 2016. The model of financial budgeting and planning for micro and small enterprises. The 16th International Scientific Conference on “Globalization and its Socio-Economic Consequences”, October 5-6, Rajecké Teplice, Slovakia, 1305–1312.
- Matzembacher, D. E.; Raudsaar, M.; de Barcellos, M. D.; & Mets, T. 2019. Sustainable entrepreneurial process: From idea generation to impact measurement, *Sustainability* 11(21): 5892. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11215892>
- Meece, J. L.; Glienke, B. B.; & Burg S. 2006. Gender and motivation, *Journal of School Psychology* 44: 351-373.
- Milošević, I.; Rajić, T.; Voza, D.; Nikolić, Đ.; & Mihajlović, I. 2015. Strategic analysis of commitment in the relationships between customers and suppliers, *Acta Oeconomica Universitatis Selye* 4(2): 118-127.
- Minárová, M. 2015. Managers in SMEs and their emotional abilities, *Acta Oeconomica Universitatis Selye* 4(1): 83-92.
- Mura, L.; Gontkovicova, B.; Dulova Spisakova, E.; & Hajduova, Z. 2019. Position of employee benefits in remuneration structure, *Transformations in Business & Economics* 18(2(47)): 156-173 .
- Murphy, E. F.; Gibson, J. W.; & Greenwood, R. A. 2010. Analyzing generational values among managers and non-managers for sustainable organizational effectiveness, *SAM Advance Management Journal* 75(1): 33-55.
- Musa, H.; Debnárová, L.; Musová, Z.; & Krištofik, P. 2017. Gender equality and corporate governance in Slovakia, *E a M: Ekonomie a Management* 20(1): 98-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2017-1-007>
- Nadeem, M.; Rana, M. S.; Lone, A. H.; Maqbool, S.; Naz, K.; & Ali, A. 2011. Teacher’s competencies and factors affecting the performance of female teachers in bahawalpur (Southern Punjab) Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 2(19): 217-222.
- Nemec, M.; Kristak, L.; Hockicko, P.; Danihelova, Z.; & Velmovska, K. 2017. Application of innovative P&E method at technical universities in Slovakia, *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 13(6), 2329-2349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.01228a>
- Nguyen, L. D.; Mujtaba, B. G.; & Ruijs, A. 2014. Stress, task, and relationship orientations of Dutch: Do age, gender, education, and government work experience make a difference? *Public Organization Review* 14(3): 305-324. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11115-013-0222-2>
- Olsovska, A.; & Svec, M. 2017. The admissibility of arbitration proceedings in labour law disputes in Slovak Republic, *E-Journal of International and Comparative Labour Studies* 6(3): 112-123.
- Olsovska, A.; Mura, L.; & Svec, M. 2015. The most recent legislative changes and their impact on interest by enterprises in agency employment: What is next in human resource management? *Problems and Perspectives in Management* 13(3): 47-54.
- Olusola, O. 2011. Intinsic motivation, job satisfaction and self-efficacy as predictors of job performance of industrial workers in ijebu zone of ogun state, *The Journal of International Social Research* 4(17): 569-577.
- Paluš, H.; Parobek, J.; Dzian, M.; Šimo-Svrček, S.; & Krahulcová, M. 2019. How companies in the wood supply chain perceive the forest certification, *Acta Facultatis Xylologiae Zvolen* 61(1): 155-165. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17423/afx.2019.61.1.15>
- Papula, J.; Kohnová, L.; & Papulová, Z. 2018. Impact of national culture on innovation activities of companies: A case of Germany, Austria, Switzerland and the Czech Republic, *Economic Annals XXI* 169(1-2): 26-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21003/ea.V169-05>
- Patton, W.; & Creed, P. 2001. Developmental issues in career maturity and career decision status, *The Career Development Quarterly* 49: 336-351.
- Peracek, T.; Noskova, M.; & Mucha, B. 2017. Selected issues of Slovak business environment. *Economic and social development (esd): managerial issues in modern business. International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development*, 254-259
- Peterson, M. 2004. What men and women value at work: Implications for workplace health, *Gender Medicine* 1(2): 106-124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1550-8579\(04\)80016-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1550-8579(04)80016-0)
- Pingping, S. 2017. Research on the innovation of enterprise employee incentive way management based on big data background, *Agro Food Industry Hi-Tech* 28(1): 1434-1438.

- Qayyum, A. 2012. An empirical analysis of employee motivation and the role of demographics, *Global Business & Management Research* 4(1): 1-14.
- Richer, S. F.; Blanchard, C.; & Vallerand, R. J. 2002. A motivational model of work turnover, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 32(10): 2089–2113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb02065.x>
- Ruzzier, M.; & Konecnik Ruzzier, M. 2014. On the relationship between firm size, resources, age at entry and internationalization: The case of Slovenian SMEs, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 16(1): 52-73. <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2012.745812>
- Ryan, R. M.; & Deci, E. L. 2000. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions, *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25(1): 54-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Salyova, S.; Taborecka-Petrovicova, J.; Nedelova, G.; & Dado, J. 2015. Effect of marketing orientation on business performance: A study from Slovak foodstuff industry, *Procedia Economics and Finance* 34: 622-629. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)01677-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01677-9)
- Sánchez-Sellero, M. C.; Sánchez-Sellero, P.; Cruz-González, M. M.; & Sánchez-Sellero, F. J. 2018. Determinants of job satisfaction in the spanish wood and paper industries: A comparative study across Spain, *Drvna Industrija* 69(1): 71-80. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5552/drind.2018.1711>
- Sedliačiková, M; Stoková, Z.; Drábek, J.; & Malá, D. 2019. Controlling implementation: What are the benefits and barriers for employees of wood processing enterprises? *Acta Facultatis Xylogologiae Zvolen* 61(2): 163-173. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17423/afx.2019.61.2.12>
- Sertić, M. B.; Barčić, A. P.; & Klarić, K. 2018. Economic determinants and analysis of the european union wood industry SMEs employment, *BioResources* 13(1): 522-534. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15376/biores.13.1.522-534>
- ShaemiBarzoki, A.; Attafar, A.; & RezaJannati, A. 2012. An analysis of factors affecting the employees motivation based on Herzberg's hygiene factors theory, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences* 6(8): 115-123.
- Sheehan, C.; De Cieri, H.; Cooper, B.; & Shea, T. 2016. Strategic implications of HR role management in a dynamic environment, *Personnel Review* 45(2): 353-373.
- Stachová, K.; Papula, J.; Stacho, Z.; & Kohnová, L. 2019. External partnerships in employee education and development as the key to facing industry 4.0 challenges, *Sustainability* 11, 345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su11020345>
- Štefko, M. 2019. Notice for reasons of redundancy as a measure for discrimination on grounds of age, *Central European Journal of Labour Law and Personnel Management* 1(1): 61-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33382/cejllpm.2019.02.05>
- Stopka, O.; Cerna, L.; & Zitricky, V. 2016. Methodology for measuring the customer satisfaction with the logistics services, *Nase More* 63(3): 189-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17818/NM/2016/SI21>
- Svec, M.; Horecky, J.; & Madlenak, A. 2018. GDPR in labour relations - with or without the consent of the employee? *AD ALTA-Journal of interdisciplinary research* 8 (2) : 281-286
- Sumit, R. 2014. Motivational theories and incentives approaches, *Indian Institute of Management Bangalore Management Review* 16(4): 43-50.
- Urbancová, H.; Vnouckova, L.; & Laboutkova, S. 2016. Knowledge transfer in a knowledge-based economy, *E & M Ekonomie a Management* 19(2): 73-86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2016-2-005>
- Vlacseková, D. 2019. Comparative analysis of motivation of civil servants and public servants in the local state administration – case study of Slovakia, *Central European Journal of Labour Law and Personnel Management* 2 (1): 74-93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33382/cejllpm.2019.02.06>
- Vydrová, J. 2018. Identification of key employee benefits relating to employee satisfaction in selected health organizations in the Czech republic, *Acta Oeconomica Universitatis Selye* 7(2): 175-187.
- Wang, W. T. 2016. Examining the influence of the social cognitive factors and relative autonomous motivations on employees' knowledge sharing behaviors, *Decision Sciences* 47(3): 404-436.
- Zaborova, E. N.; Glazkova, I. G.; & Markova, T. L. 2017. Distance learning: Students' perspective, *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya* 2: 131-139.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the project VEGA 1/0115/20 Dependence of corporate culture type upon selected socio-demographic factors and industries in Slovak enterprises, VEGA 1/0116/18 Convergence and divergence in the international human resource management, and APVV No. 18-0520 Innovative methods for analyzing the performance of wood and forestry complex using the principles of green growth.



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission

Miloš HITKA is an Associate Professor at Faculty of Wood Science and Technology, Technical University in Zvolen, Zvolen, Slovakia. His research interests are in the area of Human Resources Management. He is a Member of Editorial Boards for International Data Bases indexed Journals and the Organizing Committee of International Conferences. He is the author of many articles published in database CCC, Web of Science and SCOPUS.

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-6567-7333

Milota VETRÁKOVÁ is the Professor of the Department of Tourism at the Faculty of Economics, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. Her research interests are in Human Resources Management in Hospitality industry and in Managers Communication. She is a member of Editorial Boards of several national and international journals and member of organizing committee of scientific conferences oriented on Human Resources. She is the author of many articles published in database Web of Science and SCOPUS.

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-7837-5118

Iveta HAJDÚCHOVÁ is a Professor of Management and Financing Forest Enterprises at the Department of Forest Economics and Management at Faculty of Forestry, Technical University in Zvolen, Slovakia. She is Chair of the Scientific Committee of the International Scientific Conference Financing Forests-Wood, member of the editorial boards of the Acta Facultatis Firestalis and Journal of Economics and Social Research and member of the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Forestry Technical University in Zvolen and the Scientific Board of the Faculty of Economics Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica.

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-5352-5263

Silvia LORINCOVÁ is an Assistant Professor at Faculty of Wood Science and Technology, Technical University in Zvolen, Zvolen, Slovakia. She deals with the issue of Human Resources Management. She is the author of many articles published in database CCC, Web of Science and SCOPUS.

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-5763-5002

Imrich ANTALÍK is a Vice Dean for Science at the Faculty of Economics, J. Selye University and a lecturer at the Department of Economics. He teaches following subjects Economics of SMEs, Corporate Finance and Financial Analysis. Research interests: competitiveness of SMEs; factor flows in the border regions.

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-7060-6567

Copyright © 2020 by author(s) and V&I Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Center

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access